UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,058	12/30/2003	Edmond Heng Lim	LIMI	7391
45498 RISTO A. RIN	7590 02/22/200 NE. JR.	EXAMINER		
COMPLETE PATENTING SERVICES 2173 EAST FRANCISCO BOULEVARD, SUITE E SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901			ELKINS, GARY E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3782	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

_	۲
0	1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
`.	10/749,058	LIM, EDMOND HENG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gary E. Elkins	3782				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	1. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 D</u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 December 2006</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1,2,6-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 6-14 and 16-20 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers	•	-				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Education of the Education of the Education is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the Education is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the Education of the Educ	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Application/Control Number: 10/749,058

Art Unit: 3782

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102, 103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lim '217 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lim '217 in view of Brokop. Lim '217 discloses a folding serving tray including a beverage support member (70) which extends under a plane of a center panel (4, 44). The beverage support member (70) is considered to be fixedly attached at both ends in the erected position of the holder, i.e. the member (70) in Lim '217 is integrally formed with the carrier at (72) and is interlocked at the opposite end which is considered to fixedly attach the end against inadvertent movement. Alternatively, Brokop teaches that it is known to fixedly attach a box element (42) by gluing the element in the erect condition of the container. It would have been obvious to substitute glue for the interlock in the support member of Lim '217 as taught by Brokop to provide a non-removable and more secure end attachment of the support member. Both gluing and interlocking are well known techniques for securing box portions together.

Application/Control Number: 10/749,058

Art Unit: 3782

Page 3

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim '217 in view of either Correll '932 or Correll '949, or alternatively, Lim '217 in view of Brokop and either Correll '932 or Correll '949. Lim '217 discloses a serving tray including center panel (4), sidewalls (6, 10, 14, 18), center panel extension section (44) and support panel (70). Lim '217 does not disclose locking means either substantially identical to or equivalent to the locking means described in the specification. Each of Correll '932 and Correll '949 teaches that it is known to secure panels of a fold-box using locking means (56, 80; 42, 104, respectively). It would have been obvious to connect a corner of the tray in Lim '217 using an interlocking tab and slot construction as taught by either Correll '932 or Correll '949 to provide a stronger and more positive interlock of the corners of the tray. The beverage support member (70) in Lim '217 is considered to be fixedly attached at both ends in the erected position of the holder, i.e. the member (70) in Lim '217 is integrally formed with the carrier at (72) and is interlocked at the opposite end which is considered to fixedly attach the end against inadvertent movement. Alternatively, Brokop teaches that it is known to fixedly attach a box element (42) by gluing the element in the erect condition of the container. It would have been obvious to substitute glue for the interlock in the support member of modified Lim '217 as taught by Brokop to provide a nonremovable and more secure end attachment of the support member.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 6-14 and 16-20 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 05 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 3782

The remarks assert that the support member in Lim '217 is not fixed attached at opposite ends since the support member is capable of being detached at one end. In response, the phrase "fixedly attached" is considered to encompass an end which is fixedly attached against inadvertent removal. The end of the support member in Lim '217 is considered to be fixedly attached by interlock of the end. The phrase is also not considered to render the claim allowable insofar as gluing of the end (as an alternative to attachment using an interlock) would have been an obvious alternative connection. Both interlocks and gluing are notoriously well known ways of attaching box elements together in this art.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/749,058

Art Unit: 3782

Gary E. Elkins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3782

gee

17 February 2007

Page 5